

rural areas, more than 21 million are in locations that don't have enough health care professionals to meet their needs. Moreover, the study found that 2,000 primary care doctors are needed in rural areas.

The elements of this bill were supported by both sides of the aisle in last year's debate and were contained in several health care proposals put forth by both Republicans and Democrats. Thirty-three Democratic Senators have rallied around a sound set of principles for health care reform and invited our Republican colleagues to join us in addressing this important issue. These principles include: Insurance market reform, 100 percent health insurance tax deductibility for the self-employed, affordable coverage for children, assistance for workers who lose their jobs to keep their health coverage, and a wide range of accessible and affordable home, and community-based options for families caring for a sick parent or a disabled child.

I believe these principles are ones we, as Members of the Senate, and representative of our constituents, can support. S. 7 and the Democratic principles for reform are a sound starting point. I remain committed to working for reform of our health care system, and I hope we can work together to provide working American families with the quality health care they deserve, at a price they can afford.

I would only say, Mr. President, that if we ignore health care in this body, we are ignoring the No. 1 cost issue facing people all across America. And before we stop hearing the words "balanced budget" and all the debates that took place in that regard, let us not forget about health care. If we are ever going to address the deficit that accumulates yearly in this country, we must be concerned with health care or we will never handle the problem.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Nebraska.

If I may interrupt the Senator from Nebraska, under the previous order, morning business was to expire at 11:05.

Mr. EXON. I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for at least 5 minutes, for the purpose of brief remarks by the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to extending morning business by 5 minutes?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would just like to say a few words with regard to the bill that was introduced today.

As the body well knows, I favored the constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget. I am sorry that it did not pass. But now that it has failed, we need to press ahead to build what discipline we can into the budget process.

We are introducing today a statutory requirement that would have most, if not all, of the teeth that the constitutional amendment to balance the budget would have instituted.

The bill requires the Budget Committee to report out a resolution that shows us when we will get to a balanced budget without using the Social Security trust funds.

The practical effect of this requirement would be to require the Government to run surpluses in the unified budget, surpluses that would start to reduce—and I emphasize, reduce—the debt held by the public and prepare us for the financial needs of the next century.

Our bill enforces this requirement with a 60-vote point of order against budget resolutions that do not show how we get to balance.

The bill allows for waiver in wartime and in recessions, using the same mechanisms that Congress put in the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law.

As for the schedule, the Budget Act requires the Senate Budget Committee to report a budget resolution by April 1.

The Budget Act requires the Congress to complete action on the budget resolution conference report by April 15. I hope we can meet that deadline.

Last year, the Senate Budget Committee reported the budget resolution on March 18.

The year before last, when Congress enacted the deficit reduction bill that has reduced the deficit by over \$600 billion, the Senate Budget Committee reported the budget resolution on March 12, and Congress completed action on the conference report on April 1.

We look forward to working with the Republican majority to expeditiously fashion a budget resolution that shows us how we will get to a balanced budget and get on with the obvious work in this area that we must do.

I reserve the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES!

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, for about 3 years I have been making daily reports to the Senate regarding the exact Federal debt as of the previous day.

We must pray that this year, Federal spending will begin to be reduced. Indeed, if we care about America's future, Congress must face up to its responsibility to balance the Federal budget.

As of the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, March 8, the Federal debt stood (down to the penny) at \$4,848,281,758,236.20, meaning that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,404.16 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

It's important to note, Mr. President, that total Federal debt a little over 2 years ago (January 5, 1993) stood at \$4,167,872,986,583.67—or averaged out, \$15,986.56 for every American. During the past 2 years (that is, during the 103d Congress) the Federal debt has escalated by more than \$6 billion, which illustrates the point that so many politicians talk a good game at home

about bringing the Federal debt under control, but vote in support of bloated spending bills when they get back to Washington.

If the Republicans do not concentrate on getting a handle on this enormous debt, their constituents are not likely to overlook it 2 years hence.

ATTACKS IN PAKISTAN

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, yesterday we learned of the attack on three Americans on their way to work at the United States Consulate in Karachi, Pakistan. While they were stopped at a traffic light, gunmen jumped out of a yellow taxi and opened fire with AK-47 assault rifles.

Two of the Americans were killed: Jackie van Landingham, a secretary; and Gary Durell, a communications technician. And I know I speak for every Senator when I extend our deepest sympathy to the friends and families of these two Americans who were killed in service to their Nation in a changing and often dangerous world.

Mr. President, the third American, a young man from Framingham, MA, Mark McCloy, who worked in the consulate's post office, was injured in the attack and was taken to Agha Khan Hospital. He is now in stable condition. Last evening I spoke with his mother, Muriel McCloy, in Massachusetts, and I have assured her that the United States is doing everything we can to bring those who are responsible for this terrorist act to justice; and I assured her that we would do everything we can to bring her son home safely.

Mr. President, this attack reminds us of the dangers that exist in the world and the courage of those who choose to serve their country in spite of those dangers. We cannot underestimate the commitment of foreign service personnel who serve at a time when the post-cold-war world realigns—and the national, regional, religious, and cultural interests of peoples in every country are put to the test of sovereignty and self-determination. The courage and contribution of the men and women of the foreign service in this new world deserve our admiration and our respect.

So, Mr. President, though we are saddened by this tragedy, we are also strengthened in our appreciation of the contribution of those who serve. To the thousands of Americans around the world who have suffered the separation from families and home, from friends and loved ones, to embark on a great adventure to promote peace, understanding, and the principles of American foreign policy—in the name of those who have paid the ultimate price—we salute you.

Mr. President, for Jackie van Landingham and Gary Durell the adventure came to an end in a distant land, but for those of us at home who reap the benefits of their sacrifice, their memory will never die.

Mr. President, in light of this tragedy let us honor the thousands of men and women in the foreign service who ask little from us, but contribute a lot. And let us pray for the speedy recovery of Mark McCloy, and for the friends and families of those who, yesterday, gave their lives in service to their country.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS-SIONS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 889, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Bumpers amendment No. 330, to restrict the obligation or expenditure of funds on the NASA/Russian Cooperative MIR program.

Kassebaum amendment No. 331 (to committee amendment beginning on page 1, line 3), to limit funding of an executive order that would prohibit Federal contractors from hiring permanent replacements for striking workers.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pending is amendment No. 331, offered by the Senator from Kansas, to committee amendment beginning on page 1, line 3.

The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, if I may speak for a few moments. I spoke last night, when I offered my amendment, about what I regarded as an exceptionally important issue. I would like to go through some of those same arguments again for those who might not have been in their offices or on the floor last night.

I offered an amendment that would prevent the President's Executive order on striker replacements from taking effect. I offered the amendment because I am deeply troubled by the precedents that will be set by this Executive order.

This is not a debate about whether there should or should not be the opportunity to replace striking workers with permanent replacement workers.

As we debate this amendment, Mr. President, we will hear a great deal on both sides about the use of permanent replacements. In my view, a ban on permanent replacements will upset the fundamental balance in management-labor relations that has existed now for 60 years. We have debated this issue for

three Congresses now, and I know there are strongly held views on both sides.

That is not the only issue that is at stake here. The central issue before Members this morning is whether our national labor policy should be determined by executive fiat rather than by an act of Congress. I think this is an enormously important question, Mr. President, because it really does set a precedent that we should consider carefully.

By limiting the rights of Federal contractors to hire permanent replacements, the President has, in effect, overturned 60 years of Federal labor law with the stroke of a pen. I am not a constitutional scholar. But I do know that it is the President's role to enforce the laws, not to make them. By issuing this Executive order, the President has, in my view, overstepped his bounds.

For the first time, to my knowledge, the President has issued an Executive order that contravenes current law. The order will effectively prohibit one group, Federal contractors, from taking action that every other company is legally permitted to do under current law.

Regardless of what one thinks about the merits of the striker replacement issue, we should all be concerned about the precedent that this order will set. For example, what if a President decided to debar Federal contractors whose workers decided to go on strike?

Mr. President, the right to strike is legal, just as the right to hire permanent replacement workers for striking workers is legal. So it could eventually affect both sides of the coin if indeed we are going to start down this slippery slope.

Supporters of the President's action should think twice about the precedent this will set for future administrations that wish to alter labor law through the Federal procurement process. We will hear in the course of this debate that this Executive order is nothing new, that such orders were issued by previous administrations. The fact is that none of those Executive orders ran contrary to established labor law.

For example, President Bush issued an Executive order to enforce the Supreme Court's Beck decision. That order merely required employers to post a notice to employees informing them of the law. Its purpose was to enforce the law as set by Congress and interpreted by the courts.

No one's rights were infringed. No congressional policy was violated. No new rights were established. No existing rights were taken away. By contrast, this new Executive order overturns a legal right that has existed for 60 years and undermines the existing framework of our Federal labor law which Congress, for decades, has declined to change.

Mr. President, we all have sympathy for the situations occurring in plants today where there have been long ongoing strikes. We have sympathy for the

hardships striking workers face. But I am a strong supporter of the collective bargaining process. If indeed we tie one hand behind our back, whether it is for strikers or for employers, we have harmed the collective bargaining process.

I urge my colleagues to look at the fine print of this Executive order. It sets out a new and unprecedented enforcement and regulatory scheme, all without the slightest input of Congress. The Executive order gives the Secretary of Labor the power to determine violations of the order, a power which Congress in similar circumstances has delegated to the National Labor Relations Board.

In addition, the Executive order gives the Secretary of Labor authority to write new regulations on who will be subject to the order. Not only does the Executive order circumvent Congress by making a new law, it also creates more new regulations.

According to the Washington Post today, at least part of the administration's motivation for issuing the Executive order stems from recent strikes such as Bridgestone/Firestone Co. We can all appreciate the emotions and upheavals that occur in any labor dispute. They are troubling to each and every one of us whether it occurs in our State or not. Just weeks ago the Senate overwhelmingly rejected a sense-of-the-Senate resolution urging intervention in the Bridgestone dispute.

Here again, the administration has chosen to go around Congress by this Executive order. Many on both sides feel quite strongly about the issue of striker replacements. I believe existing law provides an appropriate balance between the interests of management and labor. But we will also hear from those who oppose this amendment because they believe that using striker replacements is inherently unfair.

That issue will be debated, I am sure, at another time. We have done so in the past. Mr. President, that misses the point. Regardless of what we believe about striker replacements, it is up to Congress and not the President to set our national labor policy through legislation. We should not relinquish that authority by permitting this Executive order to stand.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment being offered by the Labor and Human Resources Committee Chairwoman, Senator KASSEBAUM, which would prohibit funding for the implementation of the President's Executive order which was signed yesterday.

What does that Executive order do? It bars Federal contractors from hiring permanent replacement workers during an economic strike. A similar prohibition has already been included in the FEMA supplemental appropriation bill which is pending in the House.

In the event of a finding that permanent replacement workers are used in